

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 14-18, and 20-25 stand objected to due to one or more informalities. Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,035,306 (hereinafter “Lowenthal”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,849,879 (hereinafter “Chinnaswamy”).

**Objections to the Claims**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to claims 1, 2, 14-18, and 20-25 for their alleged informalities. Applicants have corrected one or more typographical errors in these claims and believe the objections to be overcome.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Lowenthal in view of Chinnaswamy. Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthal and Chinnaswamy, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-33 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the features of “traversing, within the computer associated with the database system, one or more rules trees in the set of rules trees to determine a first performance problem in the one or more performance problems that may occur while processing operations in the database based on whether the one or more values for the one

or more performance problems satisfy the one or more conditions defined for at least one rule of a node in the one or more rules trees” and “determining, within the computer associated with the database system, recommendation information indicative of a solution to the first performance problem in the one or more performance problems based on satisfaction of one or more recommendation rules associated with the node in the one or more rules trees whose at least one rule is satisfied by the one or more values.” Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthal and Chinnaswamy, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the above-recited features.

The Office Action acknowledges that Lowenthal fails to disclose rules as recited in amended claim 1, and relies on the alleged disclose of Chinnaswamy to cure such deficiencies. Yet, Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthal and Chinnaswamy, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the rules trees as recited in amended claim 1 and the use of such rules trees as recited to generate a recommendation for a solution to a first performance problem. Lowenthal and Chinnaswamy fail to disclose that each node representing symptoms in a rules tree includes both types of rules as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Lowenthal and Chinnaswamy fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Lowenthal and Chinnaswamy, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining independent claims are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application.

Appl. No. 10/775,531  
Amdt. dated July 15, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2009

PATENT

Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61924362 v1